



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/700,747

11/20/2000

Benyahia Nasli-Bakir

13877/32101

4239

26646

7590

06/01/2011

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

FLETCHER III, WILLIAM P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1715

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/01/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3 _____
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES

6 _____
7 *Ex Parte* BENYAHIA NASLI-BAKIR, STEFAN LINDBERG
8 and ANNA JANACKOVIC

9 _____
10 Appeal 2010-002997
11 Application 09/700,747
12 Technology Center 1700

13 _____
14 Oral Hearing Held: January 13, 2011

15 _____
16 Before BRADLEY R. GARRIS, ADRIENE L. HANLON, and
17 TERRY J. OWENS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

18 APPEARANCES:

19 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

20 WILLIEM F.C. de WEERD, ESQUIRE
21 Kenyon & Kenyon, LLP
22 One Broadway
23 New York, NY 10004-1007
24
25
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday,
January 13, 2011, commencing at 10:07 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Deborah
Courville, a Notary Public.

1 invention. And what I wanted to convey and what we've tried to convey
2 also in the Appeal Brief, as well as in the Reply Brief, is that there's really
3 three reasons or three issues with respect to obviousness, in view of
4 Andersson -- obviousness over Andersson in view of Lehnert, and then
5 further in view of any other -- of the other references cited. Particularly, that
6 the modifications suggested in the rejection render the teachings of
7 Andersson inoperable, and further, there is no motivation to combine these
8 references because the Examiner's -- or the rejection in the final Office
9 Action, focusing on equivalence of the amino resin and the phenolic resins is
10 merely that they're both conventional-type resins applied as adhesives in
11 these wood-type systems. But there's really no equivalence between the
12 amino resin and the phenolic resin, as applied in this system.

13 And then, finally, there is the issue of unexpected results, where when
14 in the system, as in the claimed invention, the adhesive resin/hardener
15 contains less than 20 percent of filler, wherein there is an improvement
16 found in the percentage or in the amount of delamination. The product
17 obtained by using the adhesive of the claimed invention has much better
18 delamination characteristics than those where the filler and the hardener are
19 in the adhesive exceeds the 20 weight percent.

20 So, first, let me start with Andersson. Andersson, as I said before,
21 relates to a system with separately applying adhesive, but with amino resin,
22 and the object of Andersson is to reduce bleeding from the glue joints. This
23 is a common problem, especially at the time where if you have not the best
24 mixing of the hardener and the resin, there is some resin that stays within the
25 composition and due to -- because most of Andersson applies to using wood
26 products outside in an environment where there is a lot of exposure to

1 moisture and water from rain, et cetera, you'll see a bleeding of the adhesive
2 from the joints where these wood products are joined together, and which
3 causes a darkening of the wood product, which is not desirable. And to
4 resolve this issue, Andersson specifically addresses this by -- basically in a
5 two-fold manner. One, it looks for a resin that has a low water dilutability,
6 and also it wants to have a resin that has a sufficiently high pH. The pH of
7 the resin is important in that case because it avoids the problem of a low pH
8 having low reactivity when you're using phenolic resins.

9 So, in other words, Andersson is specific for phenolic resins, and it
10 teaches that you have to have both a low water dilutability of the resin and a
11 sufficiently high pH has to be maintained.

12 Now, Lehnert is a reference where there's a method for producing a
13 plywood, and it's particularly directed to an improved cold-pressing
14 technique. And it's treated in Lehnert -- there is a -- it's attempted to reduce
15 the amount of formaldehyde emissions from the gluelam.

16 JUDGE HANLON: Excuse me. In Lehnert, is there a separate
17 application of the resin in the hardener?

18 MR. DE WEERD: No, there is not.

19 JUDGE HANLON: In the abstract, it talks about -- in the abstract of
20 Lehnert, it says in the -- a formaldehyde-based curable adhesive is applied
21 and a separate hardener is applied. One is applied to one surface as the
22 veneer layer and the other is applied to the surface of another veneer layer
23 opposite to the one coated with adhesive. That's in the abstract of Lehnert.

24 MR. DE WEERD: Right. The issue is where the Examiner has used
25 the Lehnert reference to combine with the primary reference, Andersson --

26

1 JUDGE HANLON: And to show a separate application of the
2 hardener and the resin.

3 MR. DE WEERD: I'm sorry?

4 JUDGE HANLON: And to show a separate application of a hardener
5 and a resin.

6 MR. DE WEERD: Actually, my understanding of the Final Office
7 Action is that the Examiner has applied Lehnert as a teaching that both the
8 amino resin and the phenolic resins are interchangeable and --

9 JUDGE HANLON: But do you agree that there is a separate
10 application of resin and --

11 MR. DE WEERD: There is a --

12 JUDGE HANLON: -- hardener and resin in Lehnert?

13 MR. DE WEERD: -- separate application.

14 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

15 JUDGE HANLON: I said do you agree that there's a separate
16 application of the resin and the hardener in Lehnert?

17 MR. DE WEERD: Yes. Right. I mean it says that in the abstract.

18 But the claim that -- as I wanted to point out, is that there is no
19 motivation actually to combine both the Andersson and Lehnert references
20 as in the Final Office Action.

21 JUDGE HANLON: As in what?

22 MR. DE WEERD: As in the Final Office Action.

23 JUDGE HANLON: Thank you.

24 MR. DE WEERD: Because if you would -- and as also elaborated in
25 the Appeal Brief and in the Reply Brief, if you would combine the two
26 references and modify the Andersson system with Lehnert, you wouldn't -- it

1 would -- because Andersson is specific for the phenolic acid resin and it
2 looks for low water dilutability, as well as maintaining a high pH, it would
3 destroy the teachings in Andersson.

4 JUDGE HANLON: I think the Examiner is relying on Andersson for
5 just the broad teaching that it's known in the art to apply resin and hardener
6 separately and you get various advantages to doing that.

7 MR. DE WEERD: Okay.

8 JUDGE HANLON: And I know you're focusing on another portion
9 of Andersson that is solving, maybe, a specific problem.

10 MR. DE WEERD: Sure. And I guess in addition to that, neither
11 Andersson, actually, or Lehnert focuses on the amount of filler, and as in the
12 -- as we point out, as well, in our Appeal Brief, there is an unexpected result
13 by using less than 20 percent of weight of a filler in the adhesive system, and
14 as well as high amounts of volatile acid, which are not suggested in this
15 particular system, in either Andersson or Lehnert. And the Example 1 in the
16 application clearly shows that there are some unexpected results in terms of
17 the amount of delamination observed when you're using an adhesive system
18 according to the claimed invention, compared to -- and I think this is
19 Example 4 -- I mean resin 4 in Example 1, showing a much higher
20 delamination as opposed to those -- compared to the -- as compared to those
21 that have a low -- less than 20 percent of filler in the hardener.

22 JUDGE OWENS: Do you think one of ordinary skill in the art would
23 have expected more filler to cause more delamination?

24 MR. DE WEERD: No, I think the filler was generally accepted to be
25 around 40 percent, and that would help with mixing of both the hardener and
26 the adhesive resin and --

1 JUDGE OWENS: Do you think it would get better -- less
2 delamination if you used a certain amount of filler?

3 MR. DE WEERD: I'm sorry. Can you --

4 JUDGE OWENS: You're saying -- are you saying that using a certain
5 amount of filler would cause less delamination than using no filler?

6 MR. DE WEERD: I'm not sure what -- I'm saying if you use less than
7 20 percent of filler in a hardener or a resin, you get less delamination.

8 JUDGE OWENS: Do you get less delamination at 0 percent filler
9 than you do at 20 percent filler?

10 MR. DE WEERD: Yes. I mean, that's also shown in the -- in that
11 same -- in those same examples.

12 JUDGE OWENS: So the less filler, the better?

13 MR. DE WEERD: That's right. But there is a clear distinction
14 between using 30 -- from 20 to 30 percent, and there's a big difference in
15 terms of delamination, as shown in that Example 1.

16 Now, also, with respect to the equivalency of the amino resin and the
17 phenolic acid -- and the phenolic resin, I think you've already pointed out, I
18 mean, that Lehnert -- you're saying that the Examiner has used Lehnert in a
19 different -- for a different reason than just providing the equivalency, but it's
20 our position that there really is no equivalence, or Lehnert doesn't teach that
21 both the amino resin or the phenolic resin are equivalents in the sense that
22 they're interchangeable within this adhesive system.

23 I think, actually, those are the points I wanted to make today. With
24 respect to any of the other references, we have -- as I said, we have mainly
25 focused on this Andersson and -- Andersson in view of Lehnert, because
26

1 mostly all the other rejections are based on Andersson in view of Lehnert.

2 And with that, if there are any further questions?

3 JUDGE GARRIS: Judge Hanlon, any further questions?

4 JUDGE HANLON: No.

5 JUDGE GARRIS: Judge Owens?

6 No further questions, sir.

7 MR. DE WEERD: All right, thank you.

8 JUDGE GARRIS: Thank you very much.

9 (Whereupon, the proceedings, at 10:22 a.m., were concluded.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26